March 23, 2005

Mr. Bob Schell Assistant District Attorney Dallas County District Attorney's Office 411 Elm Street, Suite 500 Dallas, Texas 75202-3384

OR2005-02507

Dear Mr. Schell:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 220724.

Dallas County (the "county") received a request for copies of all bid proposals submitted to the county in response to RFP No. 2004-140-1566. While you raise no exceptions to disclosure on behalf of the county, you indicate that release of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of six interested third parties. Accordingly you state that you notified third parties Enhanced Processing Technologies ("EPT"), Creditron Corporation ("Creditron"), Fairfax Imaging, Inc. ("Fairfax"), RT Lawrence Corporation ("RTL"), Remit Plus Software, Inc. ("Remit Plus"), and Wausau Financial Systems, Inc. ("Wausau") of the request and of each company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information pertaining to it should not be released. See § 552.305(d); see also Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Act in certain circumstances). We have received correspondence from EPT. We have considered EPT's arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that most of the information responsive to this request was the subject of a previous ruling from this office. In Open Records Letter No. 2005-00141(2005), we

concluded that the county may withhold portions of the proposals submitted by EPT and Wausau under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Furthermore, we also concluded that the information related to Creditron, Remit Plus, and RTL must be released. Therefore, assuming that the four criteria for a "previous determination" established by this office in Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) have been met, we conclude that the county must continue to rely on our decision in Open Records Letter No. 2005-00141 with respect to the information that was previously ruled upon in that decision.¹

Next, we note that the county has not sought an open records ruling from this office within ten business days as required by section 552.301(b) of the Government Code. See Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. See Gov't Code § 552.302; Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins., 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). A compelling reason for non-disclosure exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because third party interests can provide a compelling reason to withhold information, we will consider whether any of the requested information must be withheld to protect Fairfax's third party interests.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Fairfax has not submitted any comments to this office explaining how release of the information at issue would affect its proprietary interests. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that Fairfax has protected proprietary interests in the submitted information. See Gov't Code § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 639 at 4 (1996), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish prima facie case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Furthermore, you have made no

¹The four criteria for this type of "previous determination" are 1) the records or information at issue are precisely the same records or information that were previously submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(D) of the Government Code; 2) the governmental body which received the request for the records or information is the same governmental body that previously requested and received a ruling from the attorney general; 3) the attorney general's prior ruling concluded that the precise records or information are or are not excepted from disclosure under the Act; and 4) the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior attorney general ruling was based have not changed since the issuance of the ruling. See Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).

argument on behalf of the county for withholding Fairfax's information under section 552.110. Accordingly, this information may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.110 of the Government Code.

However, section 552.136 is applicable to certain account numbers and other "access devices." This section provides as follows:

- (a) In this section, "access device" means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to:
 - (1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or
 - (2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.
- (b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.

Gov't Code § 552.136. We have marked the information that the county must withhold under section 552.136.

Finally, we note that some of the submitted information appears to be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the county may continue to rely on our decision in Open Records Letter No. 2005-00141 with respect to the information that was previously ruled upon in that decision. The county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.136 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released in accordance with applicable copyright laws for any information protected by copyright. Although you request that we issue a previous determination with respect to bid proposals submitted in response to RFP 2004-140-1566, we decline to do so at this time. Accordingly, this letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code

§ 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Ramora J. Horswill

Tamara L. Harswick Assistant Attorney General Open Records Division

TLH/sdk

Ref: ID# 220724

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Andrea S. Eddy
Carreker Corporation
4055 Valley View Lane, Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75244
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Charles Dunn Enhanced Processing Technologies 14785 Preston Road, Suite 550 #27 Dallas, Texas 75254 (w/o enclosures)

Mr. Willaim Merritts
Fairfax Imaging
1 Requa Place
Piedmont, California 94611
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ernie Carlson RT Lawrence Group 14111 Freeway Drive, Suite 200 Santa Fe, California 90670 (w/o enclosures) Mr. John Koci Wausau Financial Systems P.O. Box 37 Mosinee, Wisconsin, 54455-0037 (w/o enclosures)

Creditron c/o Bob Schell Dallas County District Attorney's Office 411 Elm Street, Suite 500 Dallas, Texas 75202-3384 (w/o enclosures)

Remit Financial Software, Inc. c/o Bob Schell Dallas County District Attorney's Office 411 Elm Street, Suite 500 Dallas, Texas 75202-3384 (w/o enclosures)